

cross-channel area.” These limitations are nowhere disclosed in Ivory or strand. In particular, as clarified during the interview with the Examiner, neither Figure 2 of Strand nor Figure 22 of Ivory show that “the source fluid flow channel crosses over the target fluid flow channel *in an X fashion* at the cross-channel area” As anticipation rejection requires that each prior art reference should disclose each and every element and limitation of each claim, the anticipation rejections over Ivory and Strand should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 11, 13-18, 32, 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,277,258 to Ivory or US Patent Number 2006/0124459 to Strand, in view of US Patent Number 6,248,539 Ghardiri et al, hereinafter (“Ghardiri”).

Claims 1 and 22 have been amended to as explained above to include limitation that are nowhere disclosed in Ivory or strand. Also, Ghardiri fails to fill these gaps in Ivory and Strand. As obviousness rejection requires that the prior art should disclose the claimed invention *as a whole*, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Raj S. Davé/
Raj S. Davé, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 42,4653
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(202) 639-7515
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Intel Corporation